

Production of pentaquarks in pA -collisions

Iván Schmidt, M. Siddikov

*Departamento de Física, Universidad Técnica Federico Santa María,
y Centro Científico - Tecnológico de Valparaíso, Casilla 110-V, Valparaíso, Chile*

We argue that a hidden-charm pentaquark recently observed in weak decays of Λ_b can be produced in proton-nucleus collisions without electroweak intermediaries. We analyze the production cross-section for several scenarios of internal structure and find that a cross-section is sizable. This process can be studied both in collider as well as in fixed-target experiments. In the former case, the pentaquarks are produced at very forward rapidities, whereas in the latter case, pentaquarks are produced with relatively small rapidities and can be easily detected via invariant mass distribution of a forward J/ψ and a comoving proton. Additionally, the suggested process allows to check the existence of a neutral pentaquark P_c^0 (an isospin partner of P_c^+) predicted in several models. The rapidity and transverse momentum distributions of pentaquarks could provide comprehensive information about the $\bar{c}c$ component of this exotic baryon.

PACS numbers: 14.20.Pt, 11.10.St, 13.85.Ni

I. INTRODUCTION

The recent discovery of hidden charm pentaquarks, $P_c^+(4380)$ and $P_c^+(4450)$, in weak decays of Λ_b hyperons [1] is without any doubts an important step in the study of exotic baryons predicted by Gell-Mann [3]. The existence of the P_c^+ pentaquark agrees with early observations that there is an attractive Van der Waals like interaction between $\bar{c}c$ and light quark matter, which could lead to formation of bound states [4, 5] and could provide a natural explanation for the large intrinsic charm of the proton suggested in [6, 7] as a phenomenological description of certain charm production processes. As of now, the following facts have been established experimentally: the existence of P_c^+ , its mass, decay width and that $J/\psi p$ is one of the possible decay channels. Albeit the latter fact might indicate a large Fock component with $\bar{c}c$ in a singlet state, this does not exclude other color-spin-flavour arrangements, like for example a weakly bound state of one of the D -mesons and charmed Λ_c/Σ_c -hyperon suggested in [8–15], a bound state of χ_c and p suggested in [16], a weakly bound state of J/ψ and p [17], $\psi(2S)$ and p [18], or a strongly bound system of colored $\bar{c}c$ with light quarks [19]. The formation of pentaquark P_c^+ in low-energy phenomenological models indicates its existence [16, 20], albeit does not exclude a possibility that it is a kinematic effect due to a Landau pole singularity in a triangle diagram [21, 22]. For this reason, it was concluded that a pentaquark existence could be confirmed only after a study of additional decay channels [23], as well as confirmation of the existence of other pentaquarks from $SU(3)$ flavor symmetry decuplet [25–27].

Another way to avoid the above-mentioned anomalous triangle singularity is to study other production mechanisms and instead of weak Λ_b -decays consider photoproduction of pentaquarks in γp collisions [28–30] or πp collisions [31].

From a theoretical point of view, a crucial advantage of the P_c^+ compared to a putative Θ^+ pentaquark (see [32] for a review of Θ^+ studies) is that it possesses two massive $\bar{c}c$ quarks, whose dynamics can be described by perturbative QCD methods. Additionally, in processes where $\bar{c}c$ is produced diffractively, the typical distance between the quarks is small, $\sim 1/m_c$, and in certain cases there is an additional suppression $\sim \Lambda_{\text{QCD}}/m_c$ due to a destructive interference of interaction amplitudes from c and $\bar{c}$. This fact has been used extensively in the study of charmonium and bottomonium production, where different models successfully predict the cross-section (see [33–35] for a review of the current experimental and theoretical situation).

In this paper we suggest that P_c^+ might be produced in proton-nucleus collisions in forward kinematics, as a two-stage process discussed in the next Section II. We assume that a $\bar{c}c$ pair needed for formation of a pentaquark is produced diffractively, so we can apply the above-mentioned formalisms developed for charmonium dynamics and study dynamics of a $\bar{c}c$ pair in P_c^+ . According to our estimates, this process has a sizable cross-section, both when $\bar{c}c$ is in color singlet and in color octet states.

Potentially pentaquarks can be produced diffractively also in pp collisions, when a $\bar{c}c$ pair from extrinsic charm after interaction with the projectile leads to the formation of a $\bar{c}c$. However, typical cross-sections of this process are smaller than in case of pA collisions, and production occurs at smaller rapidities. A full analysis of diffractive pentaquark production in pp collisions will be presented elsewhere.

The paper is structured as follows. In Section II we discuss a suggested mechanism of pentaquark production and a framework which we use for its description. For the sake of simplicity in this section we consider proton-deuteron collisions, and take into account only the contribution of extrinsic charm. In Section III we generalize our framework for realistic large- A nuclei. The contribution of the intrinsic charm is discussed in Section IV. In Section V we discuss




Figure 1. Perturbative diagrams contributing to the pentaquark production if the $\bar{c}c$ pair is in color singlet state. Diagrams shown in the left (right) pane probe P -wave (S -wave) component of the $\bar{c}c$ dipole in a pentaquark. Each squared block implies a sum of diagrams with a gluon attached to each of the quarks. In a diagram (b) both emissions before and after interaction with a target are possible.




Figure 2. Perturbative diagrams contributing to the pentaquark production if the $\bar{c}c$ pair is in color octet state. Both diagrams can probe a $\bar{c}c$ dipole both in S - and P -wave. Each squared block implies a sum of diagrams with a gluon attached to each of the quarks. In case of S -wave production, there is an additional diagram with t -channel gluon attached to a projectile gluon instead of $\bar{c}c$ (not shown).

parametrizations of the pentaquark and proton light-cone wave functions, and in Section VI we present numerical estimates for the pentaquark production cross-sections.

II. PENTAQUARK PRODUCTION MECHANISMS

In this section we analyze P_c^+ production in proton-deuteron collisions at high energies, postponing a discussion of nuclear effects until Section III. The dominant production mechanism depends on the internal structure of this baryon. As was mentioned in Section I, at this moment several competing phenomenological models assume that a pentaquark is a bound state of a hidden charm meson with a proton or a charmed D -meson and Σ_c/Λ_c -hyperon. From the QCD point of view, the difference between the two classes of models is in the color state of the $\bar{c}c$ state: the former case implies that the $\bar{c}c$ pair is in a color singlet state, whereas in the latter case the $\bar{c}c$ pair is mostly in the color octet state. However, we would like to note that in QCD, if we assume dominance of a state with definite color or spin of the $\bar{c}c$ -component, due to exchange of virtual gluons between light and heavy quarks this Fock state will certainly contain a small admixture of all possible color-spin combinations.

In the leading order over $\alpha_s(m_c)$, the pentaquark production might proceed in a process schematically shown in a diagram (a) of Fig 1. This process probes a color singlet $\bar{c}c$ component of the pentaquark in a P -wave, as suggested in [16]. A $\bar{c}c$ -pair necessary for a pentaquark formation is produced via a gluon splitting in pA collisions. The produced $\bar{c}c$ has a negative invariant mass, so in order to be able to produce a near-onshell $\bar{c}c$, it should interact at least once with the target. To probe the $\bar{c}c$ pair inside a pentaquark in a color singlet S -wave, the $\bar{c}c$ pair should emit at least one gluon (jet), as shown in the diagram (b) of the Figure 1.

If the $\bar{c}c$ pair inside a pentaquark is in the color octet state, as suggested in [9–13, 19], its production might proceed via processes shown in the Figure 2. In both cases the $\bar{c}c$ pair can be produced both in S - and P -wave.

In all four diagrams the typical values of a light-cone fraction x_1 carried by a projectile gluon from a proton cannot be very small: otherwise light quarks and a $\bar{c}c$ pair separated by a large rapidity gap cannot form a bound state. At the same time, typical values of a variable $\langle x_2 \rangle \sim M_{P_c}/x_1\sqrt{s} \ll 1$. In this kinematics, application of perturbative QCD might be questionable due to saturation effects. For this reason, we adopt a dipole model which naturally incorporates all saturation effects and has been applied to the description of $\bar{c}c$ production in [36–40]. Since the produced dipoles are small and have a typical size $\langle r_{cc} \rangle \sim m_c^{-1}$, up to $\mathcal{O}(1/m_c)$ -corrections this approach is equivalent to a k_T -factorization approach suggested in [41–43], taking into account the relation of the dipole cross-section and the unintegrated gluon PDF $\mathcal{F}(x, k_\perp)$ suggested in [44].

The cross-section for the diagram (a) in the Figure 1 has the form

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\sigma^{(a)}}{dy} = & \frac{1+x_1}{x_1} x_1 g(x_1) \int d^2 R_{cc}^{(1)} d^2 R_{cc}^{(2)} d\alpha_c^{(1)} d^2 r_{cc}^{(1)} d\alpha_c^{(2)} d^2 r_{cc}^{(2)} \Phi_{cc}^{\bar{\mu}\mu}(\alpha_c^{(1)}, \vec{r}_{cc}^{(1)}) \Phi_{cc}^{\bar{\nu}\nu*}(\alpha_c^{(2)}, \vec{r}_{cc}^{(2)}) \\ & \times \Phi_D\left(-\frac{M_{P_c}}{M_{P_c}-2m_c}\vec{R}_{cc}^{(1)}\right) \Phi_D^*\left(-\frac{M_{P_c}}{M_{P_c}-2m_c}\vec{R}_{cc}^{(2)}\right) \mathcal{H}^{\bar{\mu}\mu}(\alpha_c^{(1)}, x_1, \vec{r}_{cc}^{(1)}, \vec{R}_{cc}^{(1)}) \mathcal{H}^{\bar{\nu}\nu}(\alpha_c^{(2)}, x_1, \vec{r}_{cc}^{(2)}, \vec{R}_{cc}^{(2)})^* \\ & \times \frac{1}{16} \left[\sigma(\alpha_c^{(1)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(1)} + \bar{\alpha}_c^{(2)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(2)}) + \sigma(\bar{\alpha}_c^{(1)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(1)} + \alpha_c^{(2)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(2)}) - \sigma(\alpha_c^{(1)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(1)} - \alpha_c^{(2)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(2)}) - \sigma(\bar{\alpha}_c^{(1)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(1)} - \bar{\alpha}_c^{(2)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(2)}) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where x_1 is the light-cone fraction of the nucleon carried by the gluon, $x_1 g(x_1)$ is the gluon density in a projectile proton, superscript indices 1 and 2 refer to the normal and complex conjugate amplitudes, α_c and $\vec{r}_{cc}$ are the light-cone fraction and dipole size of the c -quarks in a $\bar{c}c$ pair, and we also use variables $\vec{R}_{cc}$ for the distance between the center of mass of the pentaquark and the $\bar{c}c$ pair, $\vec{r}_i$ for the distance between the light quarks w.r.t. is center of mass¹. The impact parameter $\vec{b}$ of the pentaquark does not appear in the p_T -integrated cross-section. The notation $\mathcal{H}^{\bar{\mu}\mu}$ in 1 stands for the overlap of proton and pentaquark wave functions,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}^{\bar{\mu}\mu}(\alpha_c, \xi, \vec{r}_{cc}, \vec{R}_{cc}) = & \int \prod_{i=1}^3 (d\alpha_i dr_i) \delta^2\left(\sum_i \vec{r}_i\right) \delta\left(1 - \sum_i \alpha_i\right) d\alpha_c \\ & \times \Psi_{P_c}^\dagger\left(\frac{\alpha_i}{1+\xi}, \vec{r}_i + \vec{R}_i; \frac{\alpha_c \xi}{1+\xi}, \vec{R}_{cc} - \alpha_c \vec{r}_{cc}, \frac{\bar{\alpha}_c \xi}{1+\xi}, \vec{R}_{cc} + \bar{\alpha}_c \vec{r}_{cc}\right)^{\nu_1 \nu_2 \nu_3 \bar{\mu}\mu} \Psi_p^{\nu_1 \nu_2 \nu_3}(\alpha_i, r_i), \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where Ψ_p and Ψ_{P_c} are the light-cone wave functions of the proton and pentaquark, $\bar{\mu}/\mu$ are spinor indices of the c and $\bar{c}$, and $\xi = (P_c^+ - p^+)/p^+$ is the ratio of light-cone momenta of $\bar{c}c$ pair and light quarks. For the wave function of heavy $\bar{c}c$ dipole we use the well-known perturbative expression [45]

$$\Phi_{cc}^{\bar{\mu}\mu}(\alpha_c, r) = \frac{\sqrt{\alpha_s}}{2\pi\sqrt{2}} \xi^\mu (m_c \sigma \cdot e + i(1-2\alpha_c)(\sigma \cdot n)(e \cdot \nabla) + [n \times e] \cdot \nabla) \xi^{\bar{\mu}} K_0(\epsilon r), \quad (5)$$

where

$$\epsilon = \sqrt{m_c^2 - \alpha_c(1-\alpha_c)m_G^2}, \quad (6)$$

and m_G is the effective gluon mass. In the dipole cross-section $\sigma(r)$ for the sake of brevity here and in what follows we suppress the dependence on the Bjorken variable x_2 , tacitly assuming that a value $x_2 \approx M_{cc}^2/(x_1 s)$ is used. In (1) we assume that the light cone momentum of the nucleus is equally distributed among the nucleons: as we will show in the next Section III, the light-cone distribution of nucleons is indeed very narrow.

The term $(1+x_1)/x_1$ in the prefactor of (1) has a pole at small x_1 , which implies that the corresponding amplitude should vanish in the limit $x_1 \rightarrow 0$ in order to provide a finite integrated cross-section. As we will see below, if a realistic parametrization is used for a pentaquark wave function, indeed such behavior is observed: a $\bar{c}c$ pair separated by a large rapidity gap from the proton cannot form a pentaquark.

The variable x_1 is related to the light-cone components of the pentaquark momentum P_c in the nucleon-nucleon center of mass system as

¹ This set of variables is more convenient than the standard set of Jacobi variables $\vec{r}_{cc}, \vec{R}_{cc}, \vec{\rho}_1, \vec{\rho}_2$, where $\vec{\rho}_{1,2}$ are defined as

$$\vec{\rho}_1 = \frac{2m_c \vec{R}_{cc} + m_q \vec{r}_1}{2m_c + m_q} - \vec{R}_{cc} = \frac{m_q}{2m_c + m_q} (\vec{r}_1 - \vec{R}_{cc}), \quad (2)$$

$$\vec{\rho}_2 = \frac{(2m_c + m_q) \vec{\rho}_1 + m_q \vec{r}_2}{2m_c + 2m_q} - \vec{\rho}_1 = \frac{m_q}{2m_c + 2m_q} (\vec{r}_2 - \vec{\rho}_1), \quad (3)$$

used for description of a classical many-body systems.

$$P_c = \left((1+x_1)\sqrt{s}, \frac{M_{P_c}^2 + P_\perp^2}{(1+x_1)\sqrt{s}}, \vec{P}_\perp \right), \quad (7)$$

where $\sqrt{s}$ is a collision energy per nucleon, x_1 is the fraction of momentum carried by the gluon coming from one of the projectile protons, M_{P_c} is a pentaquark mass, for which we use a value $M_{P_c} \approx 4.4 \text{ GeV}$ both for $P_c^+(4380)$ and $P_c^+(4450)$, and $\vec{P}_\perp$ is the transverse momentum of the produced pentaquark. From 7 we can extract a relation between the rapidity y of the produced pentaquark and x_1 . This relation, in the nucleon-nucleon center of mass system, is given by

$$y = \frac{1}{2} \ln \left(\frac{P_c^+}{P_c^-} \right) = \ln \left(\frac{(1+x_1)\sqrt{s}}{\sqrt{M_{P_c}^2 + P_\perp^2}} \right), \quad (8)$$

i.e. in a collider experiments pentaquarks cannot be produced with rapidities smaller than a threshold value

$$y_{min}(s, P_\perp) = \ln \left(\frac{\sqrt{s}}{\sqrt{M_{P_c}^2 + P_\perp^2}} \right), \quad (9)$$

and are concentrated in narrow bins

$$y \in (y_{min}(s, P_\perp), y_{min}(s, P_\perp) + \ln 2). \quad (10)$$

In the nucleus rest frame, relevant for fixed target experiments, the results might be obtained by a shift

$$y_{RF} = y - \ln \left(\frac{\sqrt{s}}{m_N} \right) = \ln \left(\frac{(1+x_1)m_N}{\sqrt{M_{P_c}^2 + P_\perp^2}} \right). \quad (11)$$

The cross-section corresponding to diagram (b), which is the dominant mechanism if the $\bar{c}c$ pair inside a pentaquark is in S -wave, has the form

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\sigma^{(b)}}{dy} &= \frac{5}{8} x_1 g(x_1) \frac{1+x_1}{x_1} \int d^2 R_{cc}^{(1)} d^2 R_{cc}^{(2)} d^2 \rho d\alpha_G d\alpha_1 d^2 r_{cc}^{(1)} d\alpha_2 d^2 r_{cc}^{(2)} \\ &\times \Phi_D \left(-\frac{M_{P_c}}{M_{P_c} - 2m_c} \vec{R}_{cc}^{(1)} \right) \Phi_D^* \left(-\frac{M_{P_c}}{M_{P_c} - 2m_c} \vec{R}_{cc}^{(2)} \right) \times \\ &\sum_{n,n'=1}^6 \eta_n \eta_{n'} \text{Tr} \left[\Lambda_M \Phi_{\bar{c}c}^{(n)}(\epsilon_n, \vec{r}_n) \Phi_{cG}^{(n)}(\delta_n, \vec{\rho}_n) \right] \text{Tr} \left[\Lambda_M \Phi_{\bar{c}c}^{(n')}(\epsilon_{n'}, \vec{r}_{n'}) \Phi_{cG}^{(n')}(\delta_{n'}, \vec{\rho}_{n'}) \right], \\ &\times \sigma \left(\vec{b}_n - \vec{b}_{n'} \right) \mathcal{H}^{\bar{\mu}\mu} \left(\frac{\alpha_1}{1-\alpha_G}, x_1(1-\alpha_G), \vec{r}_{cc}^{(1)}, \vec{R}_{cc}^{(1)} \right) \mathcal{H}^{\bar{\nu}\nu} \left(\frac{\alpha_2}{1-\alpha_G}, x_1(1-\alpha_G), \vec{r}_{cc}^{(2)}, \vec{R}_{cc}^{(2)} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where in addition to the notations that appear in (1) we introduced α_G and $\vec{\rho}$ for the light-cone fraction and transverse coordinate of the emitted gluon, $\alpha_{1,2}$ for the light-cone fractions of the incident gluon momentum carried by the c -quark in the amplitude and its conjugate. The gluon emission wave function Φ_{cg} in (12) has the form

$$\Phi_{cg}(\beta, \rho) \approx \frac{i\sqrt{\alpha_s}}{\pi\sqrt{3}} \xi_\mu^\dagger \hat{\mathcal{D}} \xi_{\bar{\mu}} K_0(\delta|\vec{\rho}|), \quad (13)$$

where

$$\hat{\mathcal{D}} = 2 \left(1 - \frac{\beta_1}{2} \right) e_f \cdot \nabla + im_c \beta_1^2 (n \times e_f) \cdot \sigma - i\beta_1 (\nabla \times e_f) \cdot \sigma, \quad (14)$$

$$\delta = \sqrt{\beta^2 m_c^2 + (1-\beta) m_G^2}, \quad (15)$$

e_f is a polarization vector of the emitted gluon, μ and $\bar{\mu}$ are helicities of the quark before/after emission, and β is the ratio of the gluon light-cone fraction to the light cone fraction of the initial quark. The vector $\vec{r}_n$, $\vec{\rho}_n$, $\vec{b}_n$, as well as the coefficients ϵ , δ in (5,13) are given by ²

$$\epsilon_1^2 = \epsilon_3^2 = m_c^2 - (1 - \alpha - \alpha_G)(\alpha + \alpha_G)\lambda^2 \quad (16)$$

$$\delta_1^2 = \delta_5^2 = \alpha_G^2 m_c^2 + \alpha(\alpha + \alpha_G)\lambda^2 \quad (17)$$

$$\delta_3^2 = \epsilon_5^2 = \frac{(\alpha + \alpha_G)(1 - \alpha_G)(\alpha_G m_c^2 + \alpha(1 - \alpha - \alpha_G)\lambda^2)}{1 - \alpha - \alpha_G} \quad (18)$$

$$\delta_2^2 = \delta_6^2 = \alpha_G^2 m_c^2 + (1 - \alpha)(1 - \alpha - \alpha_G)\lambda^2 \quad (19)$$

$$\delta_4^2 = \epsilon_6^2 = \frac{(1 - \alpha_G)(1 - \alpha)(\alpha_G m_c^2 + \alpha(1 - \alpha - \alpha_G)\lambda^2)}{\alpha} \quad (20)$$

$$\epsilon_2^2 = \epsilon_4^2 = m_c^2 - (1 - \alpha)\alpha\lambda^2 \quad (21)$$

$$\vec{r}_1 = \vec{r}_3 = \vec{r}_5 = \frac{\alpha\vec{r} - \alpha_G\vec{\rho}}{\alpha + \alpha_G}, \quad \vec{\rho}_1 = \vec{\rho}_3 = \vec{\rho}_5 = -\frac{\vec{\rho} + (1 - \alpha - \alpha_G)\vec{r}}{\alpha + \alpha_G} \quad (22)$$

$$\vec{r}_2 = \vec{r}_4 = \vec{r}_6 = -\frac{(1 - \alpha - \alpha_G)\vec{r} + \alpha_G\vec{\rho}}{1 - \alpha}, \quad \vec{\rho}_2 = \vec{\rho}_4 = \vec{\rho}_6 = -\frac{\vec{\rho} - \alpha\vec{r}}{1 - \alpha} \quad (23)$$

$$\vec{b}_1 = \vec{b} + \frac{\alpha_G}{\alpha + \alpha_G}\vec{\rho} - \frac{\alpha(1 - \alpha - \alpha_G)}{\alpha + \alpha_G}\vec{r}, \quad \vec{b}_2 = \vec{b} + \frac{\alpha_G}{1 - \alpha}\vec{\rho} + \frac{\alpha(1 - \alpha - \alpha_G)}{1 - \alpha}\vec{r}, \quad (24)$$

$$\vec{b}_3 = \vec{b}_6 = \vec{b} - (1 - \alpha - \alpha_G)\vec{r}, \quad \vec{b}_4 = \vec{b}_5 = \vec{b} + \alpha\vec{r}. \quad (25)$$

and $\eta_n = \{1, 1, -1, -1, -\alpha_G, -\alpha_G\}$.

If the $\bar{c}c$ pair is in a color octet state, its production may proceed via any of the mechanisms shown in the Figure (2). The diagram (c) has the cross-section

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\sigma^{(c)}}{dy} &= \frac{1 + x_1}{x_1} x_1 g(x_1) \int d\alpha_G \int d^2\rho \int d^2 R_{\bar{c}c}^{(1)} d^2 R_{\bar{c}c}^{(2)} d\alpha_c^{(1)} d^2 r_{cc}^{(1)} d\alpha_c^{(2)} d^2 r_{cc}^{(2)} \Phi_D \left(-\frac{M_{P_c}}{M_{P_c} - 2m_c} \vec{R}_{\bar{c}c}^{(1)} \right) \\ &\times \Phi_D^* \left(-\frac{M_{P_c}}{M_{P_c} - 2m_c} \vec{R}_{\bar{c}c}^{(2)} \right) \Sigma^{(L)} \left(\alpha_c^{(1)}, r_{cc}^{(1)}, \alpha_c^{(2)}, r_{cc}^{(2)} \right) \bar{\Psi}^{\bar{\mu}\mu*} \left(\alpha_c^{(1)}, r_{cc}^{(1)} \right) \mathcal{O}_{P_c}^{\bar{\mu}\mu} \left(\alpha_c^{(1)}, \alpha_G, x_1, \vec{\rho}, \vec{R}_{\bar{c}c}^{(1)} \right) \\ &\times \bar{\Psi}^{\bar{\nu}\nu} \left(\alpha_c^{(2)}, r_{cc}^{(2)} \right) \mathcal{O}_{P_c}^{\bar{\nu}\nu*} \left(\alpha_c^{(2)}, \alpha_G, x_1, \vec{\rho}, \vec{R}_{\bar{c}c}^{(2)} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where we introduced the shorthand notation $\Sigma^{(L)}$ for the cross-section of the $\bar{c}c$ with internal orbital momentum L ,

$$\Sigma^{(L=0)} \left(\alpha_c^{(1)}, r_{cc}^{(1)}, \alpha_c^{(2)}, r_{cc}^{(2)} \right) = \frac{9}{16} \left[\sigma \left(\alpha_c^{(1)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(1)} + \bar{\alpha}_c^{(2)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(2)} \right) + \sigma \left(\bar{\alpha}_c^{(1)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(1)} + \alpha_c^{(2)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(2)} \right) - \sigma \left(\alpha_c^{(1)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(1)} - \alpha_c^{(2)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(2)} \right) \right. \\ \left. - \sigma \left(\bar{\alpha}_c^{(1)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(1)} - \bar{\alpha}_c^{(2)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(2)} \right) \right], \quad (27)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma^{(L=1)} \left(\alpha_c^{(1)}, r_{cc}^{(1)}, \alpha_c^{(2)}, r_{cc}^{(2)} \right) &= \frac{5}{16} \left[\sigma \left(\alpha_c^{(1)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(1)} + \bar{\alpha}_c^{(2)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(2)} \right) + \sigma \left(\bar{\alpha}_c^{(1)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(1)} + \alpha_c^{(2)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(2)} \right) + \sigma \left(\alpha_c^{(1)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(1)} - \alpha_c^{(2)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(2)} \right) \right. \\ &+ \sigma \left(\bar{\alpha}_c^{(1)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(1)} - \bar{\alpha}_c^{(2)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(2)} \right) - 2\sigma \left(\alpha_c^{(1)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(1)} \right) - 2\sigma \left(\bar{\alpha}_c^{(1)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(1)} \right) - 2\sigma \left(\alpha_c^{(2)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(2)} \right) \\ &\left. - 2\sigma \left(\bar{\alpha}_c^{(2)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(2)} \right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_{P_c}^{\bar{\mu}\mu} \left(\alpha_c, \alpha_G, \xi, \vec{\rho}, \vec{R}_{\bar{c}c} \right) &= 3 \int \prod_{k=1}^3 (d\alpha_k d^2 r_k) \delta^2 \left(\sum_k \vec{r}_k \right) \delta \left(1 - \sum_k \alpha_k \right) \Phi_{cG} \left(\frac{\vec{\rho} - \alpha_G \vec{r}_1}{1 - \alpha_1} \right) \\ &\times \Psi_{P_c}^{\bar{\mu}\mu\dagger} \left(\left\{ \frac{\alpha_k - \alpha_G \delta_{k1}}{1 + \xi - \alpha_G}, \vec{r}_k + \vec{R}_l \right\}; \frac{\alpha_c \xi}{1 + \xi - \alpha_G}, \vec{R}_{\bar{c}c} - \alpha_c \vec{r}_{\bar{c}c}, \frac{\bar{\alpha}_c \xi}{1 + \xi - \alpha_G}, \vec{R}_{\bar{c}c} + \bar{\alpha}_c \vec{r}_{\bar{c}c} \right) \\ &\times \psi_p(\{\alpha_k, \vec{r}_k\}) \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

² If we use a coordinate space evaluation, naively we could expect that the coefficients ϵ for diagrams (5,6) should fulfill $\epsilon_5 = \epsilon_1$, $\epsilon_6 = \epsilon_2$, but this is not so. This happens because in the evaluation of (5) at least one of the quarks should be onshell, which is no longer true. In the same way, offshellness of the final quark in the evaluation of diagrams (3,4) leads to $\delta_3 \neq \delta_1$ and $\delta_4 \neq \delta_2$.




Figure 3. (color online) General multipomeron configurations which contribute to a diagram (d) [upper plot] cannot be expressed in terms of a dipole cross-section. However, the largest intercept has a two-pomeron configuration [lower plot] (see the text for explanations).

for the overlap, numbering the active quark from which the emission takes place with the index 1. As we will see below, this diagram is small since the light quarks both in a proton and in a pentaquark are almost onshell.

The evaluation of diagram (d) in the general case is challenging, since under reggeization potentially we may get multipomeron contributions as shown in the upper part of the Figure 3. These contributions are not reducible to a mere dipole cross-section and their evaluation presents a complicated problem. However, as was shown in [46, 47], in the large- N_c limit the intercepts of these contributions are smaller, so the dominant contribution at very high energies is a two-pomeron contribution shown in the lower part of Figure 3. In this limit the corresponding cross-section is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
 \frac{d\sigma^{(d)}}{dy} = & 3 \frac{1+x_1}{x_1} x_1 g(x_1) \int d\alpha_G \int d^2\rho \int d^2 R_{cc}^{(1)} \int d^2 R_{cc}^{(2)} d\alpha_c^{(1)} d^2 r_{cc}^{(1)} d\alpha_c^{(2)} d^2 r_{cc}^{(2)} \\
 & \times \Phi_D \left(-\frac{M_{P_c}}{M_{P_c} - 2m_c} \vec{R}_{cc}^{(1)} \right) \Phi_D^* \left(-\frac{M_{P_c}}{M_{P_c} - 2m_c} \vec{R}_{cc}^{(2)} \right) \\
 & \times \int d^2 b \mathcal{N} \left(\alpha_c^{(1)} \vec{r}_1^{(1)} - \alpha_c^{(2)} \vec{r}_1^{(2)}, \vec{b} + \vec{R}_l^{(12)} \right) \mathcal{S}^{(L)} \left(\alpha_c^{(1)}, r_{cc}^{(1)}, \alpha_c^{(2)}, r_{cc}^{(2)}, \vec{b} - \vec{R}_{cc}^{(12)} \right) \\
 & \times \bar{\Psi}^{\bar{\mu}\mu*} \left(\alpha_c^{(1)}, r_{cc}^{(1)} \right) \bar{\Psi}^{\bar{\nu}\nu} \left(\alpha_c^{(2)}, r_{cc}^{(2)} \right) \mathcal{O}_{P_c}^{\bar{\mu}\mu} \left(\alpha_c^{(1)}, \alpha_G, x_1, \vec{\rho}, \vec{R}_{cc}^{(1)} \right) \mathcal{O}_{P_c}^{\bar{\nu}\nu*} \left(\alpha_c^{(2)}, \alpha_G, x_1, \vec{\rho}, \vec{R}_{cc}^{(2)} \right),
 \end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

where we introduced the notation

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{S}^{(L=0)} \left(\alpha_c^{(1)}, r_{cc}^{(1)}, \alpha_c^{(2)}, r_{cc}^{(2)}, \vec{b} \right) = & \frac{9}{16} \left[\mathcal{N} \left(\alpha_c^{(1)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(1)} + \bar{\alpha}_c^{(2)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(2)}, \vec{b} \right) + \mathcal{N} \left(\bar{\alpha}_c^{(1)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(1)} + \alpha_c^{(2)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(2)}, \vec{b} \right) \right. \\
 & \left. - \mathcal{N} \left(\alpha_c^{(1)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(1)} - \alpha_c^{(2)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(2)}, \vec{b} \right) - \mathcal{N} \left(\bar{\alpha}_c^{(1)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(1)} - \bar{\alpha}_c^{(2)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(2)}, \vec{b} \right) \right],
 \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{S}^{(L=1)} \left(\alpha_c^{(1)}, r_{cc}^{(1)}, \alpha_c^{(2)}, r_{cc}^{(2)}, \vec{b} \right) = & \frac{5}{16} \left[\mathcal{N} \left(\alpha_c^{(1)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(1)} + \bar{\alpha}_c^{(2)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(2)}, \vec{b} \right) + \mathcal{N} \left(\bar{\alpha}_c^{(1)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(1)} + \alpha_c^{(2)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(2)}, \vec{b} \right) \right. \\ & + \mathcal{N} \left(\alpha_c^{(1)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(1)} - \alpha_c^{(2)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(2)}, \vec{b} \right) + \mathcal{N} \left(\bar{\alpha}_c^{(1)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(1)} - \bar{\alpha}_c^{(2)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(2)}, \vec{b} \right) \\ & \left. - 2\mathcal{N} \left(\alpha_c^{(1)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(1)}, \vec{b} \right) - 2\mathcal{N} \left(\bar{\alpha}_c^{(1)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(1)}, \vec{b} \right) - 2\mathcal{N} \left(\alpha_c^{(2)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(2)}, \vec{b} \right) - 2\mathcal{N} \left(\bar{\alpha}_c^{(2)} \vec{r}_{cc}^{(2)}, \vec{b} \right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where L is the orbital momentum of internal motion of the $\bar{c}c$ pair, and $\mathcal{N}(\vec{r}, \vec{b})$ is the dipole scattering amplitude [48] related to the dipole cross-section as

$$\sigma(r) = \int d^2b \mathcal{N}(\vec{r}, \vec{b}). \quad (33)$$

III. EFFECTIVE WAVE FUNCTION FROM 2N CORRELATIONS

In the previous Section II we considered pentaquark production in proton-deuteron collisions. In the case of a heavy nucleus, we should replace the deuteron wave function with a two-nucleon correlator. It was realized some time ago that this object has properties similar to a deuteron wave function [49, 50], namely vanishes if the distance R between the two nucleons is smaller than 1 fm, and is suppressed at $R \gg 2$ fm. A discussion of two-nucleon correlations is usually done in terms of the two-particle density

$$\rho_2(\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2) = A(A-1) \int \prod_{i=3}^A |\Psi_A(x_1, \dots, x_A)|^2 \approx A(A-1) \rho(\vec{x}_1) \rho(\vec{x}_2) (1 - C(\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2)), \quad (34)$$

where $\rho(\vec{x})$ is a normalized to unity (one-particle nuclear density), and the function $C(\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2)$ interpolates smoothly from 1 at distances smaller than 1 fm to 0 at distances larger than 2-3 fm. This object has been extensively studied in various theoretical models of nuclear structure [51–55], yielding similar results. For infinite nuclear matter, as well as inside a finite nuclei far from a nuclear border, $C(\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2)$ depends only on the distance between the two nucleons,

$$C(\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2)|_{|\vec{x}_{1,2}| \ll R_A} \approx C(r = |\vec{x}_1 - \vec{x}_2|). \quad (35)$$

Experimentally, a nonzero value of the function C reveals itself in short-range correlations (SRC) of two nucleon pairs knocked out with large momentum, $k > k_F$ [56, 57], where k_F is a Fermi momentum. As was found in [58–60], this effect depends on the isospin of the nucleons, and the dominant contribution (>90%) comes from pn correlations. However, SRCs can appear not only in specially crafted observables: as was demonstrated in [61], even the total quasielastic nucleon-nucleus cross-section is reduced by 15% due to SRCs.

From (34) we may deduce a probability to find two nucleons separated by a distance r , provided at least one of the nucleons is a proton,

$$\rho_{2N}(\vec{r}) \approx (AZ - 1) \int d^3X \rho\left(\vec{X} - \frac{\vec{r}}{2}\right) \rho\left(\vec{X} + \frac{\vec{r}}{2}\right) (1 - C(r)). \quad (36)$$

In what follows it is convenient to introduce an effective wave function of relative motion of the $2N$ system, which we define as

$$\Phi_{2N}(\vec{r}) \equiv \rho_{2N}^{1/2}(\vec{r}) \approx \left[(AZ - 1) \int d^3X \rho\left(\vec{X} - \frac{\vec{r}}{2}\right) \rho\left(\vec{X} + \frac{\vec{r}}{2}\right) (1 - C(r)) \right]^{1/2}, \quad (37)$$

and use a parametrization of $C(r)$ taken from [51], with a Woods-Saxon parametrization for nuclear densities. As one can see from the Figure 4, the shape of the wave function $\Phi_{2N}(\vec{r})$ inside lead is very similar to the realistic deuteron wave function evaluated with an Argonne v_{18} -potential [62]. In our evaluations the wave function (37) contributes in convolution with the pentaquark wave function, so the dominant contribution stems from the region $r \sim 2 - 3$ fm.

The two-nucleon wave function (37) is given in the nucleus rest frame, whereas in equations (1,12,26,30) we need a wave function in the light-cone formalism. In the general case a relation between the two objects is a nontrivial dynamical problem, however, under assumption that a motion of nucleons inside the nucleus is nonrelativistic, we may use the relation suggested in [63, 64]

$$\tilde{\Phi}_{2N}(\alpha, k_\perp) = \sqrt[4]{\frac{k_\perp^2 + m_N^2}{4[\alpha(1-\alpha)]^3}} \tilde{\Phi}_{2N} \left(k = \sqrt{\frac{k_\perp^2 + (2\alpha - 1)^2 m_N^2}{4\alpha(1-\alpha)}} \right), \quad (38)$$




Figure 4. (color online) Comparison of the effective 2-nucleon wave function Φ_{2N} (37) (green solid lines) with components of realistic deuteron wave function evaluated with Argonne v_{18} potential [62] (blue dashed lines). The function Φ_{2N} is scaled by arbitrary factor to match the peak value of the deuteron wave function component $u(r)$.

where $\tilde{\Phi}_{2N}$ stands for a Fourier transform of the corresponding wave function. As follows from (38) and is seen from the left pane of the Figure 5, the α -dependence of the wave function is strongly peaked near a value $\alpha \approx 1/2$, for this reason in Equations (1,12,26,30) we do not write a convolution over a light-cone fraction α carried by a nucleon, tacitly assuming that for all physical observables

$$\int d\alpha \Phi_{2N}(\alpha, r_{\perp}) \mathcal{A}(\alpha, \dots) \approx \int d\alpha \Phi_{2N}(\alpha, r_{\perp}) \mathcal{A}\left(\alpha \approx \frac{1}{2}, \dots\right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\left\langle\left(\alpha - \frac{1}{2}\right)^2\right\rangle\right), \quad (39)$$

i.e. in Equations (1,12,26,30) we should replace the deuteron wave function Φ_D with

$$\Phi_{LC}^{2D}(r_{\perp}) = \int d\alpha \Phi_{2N}(\alpha, r_{\perp}) \quad (40)$$

In the right pane of the Figure 5 we compare the $\Phi_{LC}^{2D}(r_{\perp})$ with a rest frame wave function (37). As we can see, the difference between the two objects is relevant only at small- r .

IV. ON INTRINSIC CHARM CONTRIBUTION

In addition to the extrinsic charm contribution discussed in a previous Section II, an additional contribution might be due to intrinsic charm of a projectile proton, first suggested in [6, 7]. This intrinsic charm is known with considerable uncertainty (see e.g. [24] for a short review). Its contribution to forward pentaquark production might be obtained by a simple replacement of extrinsic charm with intrinsic charm wave function in (1,12,26,30),

$$x_1 g(x_1) \bar{\Psi}^{\bar{\mu}\mu*}(\alpha_c, r_{cc}) \Phi_D\left(-\frac{M_{P_c}}{M_{P_c} - 2m_c} \vec{R}_{cc}\right) \Psi_N^{\nu_1\nu_2\nu_3}(\alpha_i, \vec{r}_i) \rightarrow \sqrt{P_5} \Psi_{IC}^{\bar{\mu}\mu\nu_1\nu_2\nu_3}(\alpha_i, \vec{r}_i), \quad (41)$$

where P_5 is a normalization coefficient which takes into account the amount of intrinsic charm inside a proton, and Ψ_{IC} is the (unknown) wave function of the $uudc\bar{c}$ Fock component. Usually the amount of intrinsic charm is quantized




Figure 5. (color online) Left: α -dependence of the light-cone correlator $\Phi_{2N}(\alpha, r_\perp)$ for several fixed values of r . As we can see, the peak is very narrow. Right: Comparison of the light-cone wave function $\Phi_{LC}^{2D}(r_\perp)$ from (40) (solid line) and 3D wave function (37) (dashed line). $\sqrt{m_N}$ is added to match dimensions.

in terms of the fraction of the momentum of a proton carried by $\bar{c}c$, and current phenomenological estimates for this quantity indicate a very small amount, $\langle x \rangle_{IC} \sim 0.15 - 0.5\%$ [24]. In view of this, in what follows we neglect the contribution of the intrinsic charm, tacitly assuming that its contribution could only increase the extrinsic charm cross-sections. Besides, in case of pA collisions we expect that the extrinsic charm cross-sections will be enhanced by a factor $\sim A^{1/3}$ compared to the intrinsic charm contribution.

V. PARAMETRIZATION OF PENTAQUARK AND NUCLEON WAVE FUNCTION

While there are very detailed theoretical models for internal structure of a putative Θ^+ (see e.g. [65, 66]), as of now there is no parameterizations of the light-cone wave functions of the P_c -pentaquark known from the literature. From phenomenological models it is expected that a pentaquark P_c could be a “molecular” state of $J/\psi p$, $\chi_c p$, $\Sigma_c \bar{D}$ or $\Lambda_c \bar{D}$. This implies that a $\bar{c}c$ can be predominantly either in a color singlet or in a color octet state. In the general case, wave functions obtained in effective models are in the rest frame of the baryon. Boosting them to a light-cone frame presents a complicated dynamical problem and mixes Fock components with different number of quarks. For this reason, a direct modeling might be a better approach. For this pioneering study, we completely disregard the spin structure of light quarks both in the pentaquark and in the proton, tacitly assuming that it is the same. We assume that the proton wave function in its rest frame has the form [37]

$$\Psi_p(\{\alpha_i, \vec{r}_i\}) = f_3(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3) \frac{\sqrt{3}}{\pi R_p^2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2R_p^2}(r_1^2 + r_2^2 + r_3^2)\right) \Bigg|_{\sum_i \vec{r}_i = 0}, \quad (42)$$

where the parameter a is fixed from the charge radius of the proton r_{ch}^2 and equals $a = 3/(2r_{ch}^2)$. For modelling the light-cone dependence of a pentaquark, we follow the general receipt suggested long ago in [6, 7] for a baryon with n constituents and choose

$$f_n(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) = \frac{N_n}{\left(M_B^2 - \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{m_i^2}{\alpha_i}\right)} \Bigg|_{\sum \alpha_i = 1}, \quad (43)$$

where M_B is a mass of a baryon and m_i is the mass of constituent quarks. This function has a smooth behavior provided $M_B < \sum m_i$. For the masses of light and heavy quarks in what follows we take $m_l \approx 0.35$ GeV and




Figure 6. (color online) Dependence of the overlap of proton and pentaquark wave functions on x_1 and α_c .

$m_c \approx 1.8$ GeV respectively. The normalization constant N_n is fixed from the normalization condition

$$\int \prod_i d\alpha_i \delta\left(1 - \sum_i \alpha_i\right) |f(\{\alpha_i\})|^2 = 1. \quad (44)$$

As was discussed in [6, 7], this function provides a correct endpoint behavior of parton PDFs near $\alpha_i \approx 1$. Also, it vanishes when a light-cone fraction of any parton goes to zero, which guarantees that the total cross-section is finite, as was discussed in the previous Section II.

For the pentaquark, modeling is a bit more complicated due to a myriads of possible spin-orbital arrangements of all quarks. For us it is important to distinguish the case when $\bar{c}c$ pair is either in S -wave or in a P -wave. In what follows, we assume that it has a structure similar to (42),

$$\Psi_{P_c}(\{\alpha_i, \vec{r}_i\}) = f_5(\alpha_i) v^{\bar{\mu}}(p_{\bar{c}}) u^{\mu}(p_c) \frac{\sqrt{3}}{\pi R_p^2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2R_p^2}(r_1^2 + r_2^2 + r_3^2)\right) \Bigg|_{\sum_i \vec{r}_i = 0} \times \quad (45)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \times \frac{\hat{U}(\vec{r}_{cc})}{\pi \langle r_{cc} \rangle \langle R_{cc} \rangle} \exp\left(-\frac{r_{cc}^2}{2 \langle r_{cc}^2 \rangle} - \frac{R_{cc}^2}{2 \langle R_{cc}^2 \rangle}\right), \\ \hat{U}(\vec{r}_{cc}) = & \begin{cases} 1 & \bar{c}c = S\text{-wave, octet} \\ \mathcal{N}_{2S}(r_{cc} - a_{2S}) & S\text{-wave, singlet} \\ \left(\frac{x_{\bar{c}c} \pm i y_{\bar{c}c}}{\sqrt{2} \langle r_{cc} \rangle}\right) & P\text{-wave} \end{cases}, \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

where $x_{\bar{c}c}$, $y_{\bar{c}c}$ are the components of the vector $\vec{r}_{cc}$, $v^{\bar{\mu}}$ and u^{μ} are spinors which correspond to the $\bar{c}$ and c -quark³, and f_5 is given by (43). For the color singlet S -wave we assume that the wave function has a node⁴, i.e. it is a bound state of $\psi(2S)$ and a proton, as suggested in [18]. The node position $a_{2S} = \langle r_{cc} \rangle \sqrt{\pi}/2$ and the value of a normalization constant $\mathcal{N}_{2S} = 2/(\langle r_{cc} \rangle \sqrt{4 - \pi})$ may be extracted from orthonormality with the 1S state and are in reasonable agreement with numerical solutions from potential models of charmonium [67],

For a singlet $\bar{c}c$, the relevant cross-section is controlled by an overlap (4), which in this case takes the form

$$\mathcal{H}^{\bar{\mu}\mu}(\alpha_c, \xi, \vec{r}_{cc}, \vec{R}_{\bar{c}c}) = \frac{\hat{U}(\vec{r}_{cc})}{\pi \langle r_{cc} \rangle \langle R_{cc} \rangle} v^{\bar{\mu}}(p_{\bar{c}}) u^{\mu}(p_c) f_{3,5}(\xi, \alpha_c) \exp\left(-\frac{r_{cc}^2}{2 \langle r_{cc}^2 \rangle} - \frac{R_{cc}^2}{2 \langle R_{cc}^2 \rangle}\right), \quad (47)$$

and we introduced a shorthand notation

$$f_{3,5}(\xi, \alpha_c) \equiv \int \prod_{i=1}^3 d\alpha_i f_5\left(\left\{\frac{\alpha_i}{1+\xi}\right\}_{\text{light}}, \frac{\xi \alpha_c}{1+\xi}, \frac{\xi \bar{\alpha}_c}{1+\xi}\right) f_3(\alpha_i) \delta\left(\sum_i \alpha_i = 1\right). \quad (48)$$

³ The parametrization (45) assumes that the $\bar{c}c$ pair in a pentaquark can have any spin with equal probability. In the case of models with internal structure additional spin projectors should be added. We expect the uncertainty due to spin factors to result in a factor of two uncertainty in the cross-section.

⁴ If we assume that the $\bar{c}c$ pair inside a P_c^+ is in a color singlet 1S state and does not have any nodes, it would be challenging to explain a relatively narrow width of its decay into J/ψ and p .

$\sqrt{s}$	$y_{min}(\sqrt{s}, P_c^\perp \approx 0)$	(a)	(b)	(c), $L = 0$	(c), $L = 1$	(d), $L = 0$	(d), $L = 1$
200 GeV	3.8	$0.6 \mu\text{b}$	16 nb	6.5 nb	47 nb	2.9 nb	8.9 nb
7 TeV	7.4	$1.9 \mu\text{b}$	120 nb	137 nb	135 nb	19 nb	8.2 nb
13 TeV	8	$2 \mu\text{b}$	163 nb	208 nb	142 nb	20.4 nb	6.08 nb

Table I. Pentaquark production cross-sections with different mechanisms. Diagrams (a) and (b) correspond to color singlet, (c) and (d) to color octet states. L is the orbital angular momentum of the pentaquark.

The dependence of the overlap $f_{3,5}(\xi, \alpha_c)$ is shown in Figure 6. For very small- x , it vanishes roughly as $f_{3,5}(\xi, \alpha_c) \sim \xi$. Physically, this means that it is not possible to form a pentaquark if the $\bar{c}c$ is separated by a large rapidity gap from the proton. As a function of α_c , the distribution is close to the asymptotic form $\sim \alpha_c(1 - \alpha_c)$.

VI. NUMERICAL RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this paper we consider only the $P_\perp$ -integrated cross-section. Since nothing is known about the light-cone wave function of the pentaquark, in what follows we fix the values of parameters in the pentaquark wave function 45 as

$$\langle R_{cc}^2 \rangle \approx \frac{2}{3} \langle R_p^2 \rangle \approx (0.98 \text{ fm})^2, \quad \langle r_{cc}^2 \rangle \approx \frac{2}{3} \langle r_{J/\psi}^2 \rangle \approx (0.33 \text{ fm})^2, \quad m_c \approx 1.5 \text{ GeV}. \quad (49)$$

The value of $\langle R_{cc} \rangle$ in (49) corresponds to the average distance between a proton and a $\bar{c}c$ pair, $\langle R_{P_c} \rangle \approx M_{P_c}/(M_{P_c} - 2m_c) \approx 3 \text{ fm}$ in agreement with a pentaquark-as-molecule picture [9–14, 16–18].

For the dipole cross-section $\sigma(r)$, we use a GBW parametrization [44]. The key virtue of this parametrization is that due to its simplicity it allows to simplify some integrals. For typical values of $\langle r_{cc} \rangle \sim 2/m_c$ this parametrization differs from more accurate IP-Sat fit [68] within 10-20%, much less than an uncertainty due to pentaquark wave function. For the b -dependent cross-section $\mathcal{N}(\vec{r}, \vec{b})$ in (30) we take the simple factorized form

$$\mathcal{N}(\vec{r}, \vec{b}) = \sigma(r)T(b), \quad (50)$$

$$T(b) = \frac{1}{2\pi B_D} \exp\left(-\frac{b^2}{2B_D}\right), \quad (51)$$

with $B_D = 4 \text{ GeV}^{-2}$. This simplification allows to evaluate analytically integrals over transverse coordinates in (30). For heavy dipoles of size $\langle r_{cc} \rangle \sim 2/m_c$ this approximation differs from a more elaborated IP-Sat fit [68] by small $\sim 1/m_c^2$ corrections.

Our estimates of pentaquark cross-section with different mechanisms are summarized in a table I. As we can see, the cross-section is largest for diagram (a), when a pentaquark is produced in a P -wave. Due to a node in the r_{cc} -dependence, cross-section (b) is relatively small, and the numerical value depends a lot on the position of the node, due to partial cancellation of small and large- r_{cc} contributions. The value chosen in the previous Section V corresponds to a node position in $\psi(2S)$ wave function known from potential models. However, due to additional Van-der-Waals forces acting on $\bar{c}c$ this position might be different. For diagram (c) the cross-section is small because the binding energies of the initial proton inside a nucleus and light quarks inside a pentaquark are small. The diagram (d) is small since a pentaquark is produced diffractively and a proton has to interact both with light quarks and $\bar{c}c$ pair separated by a large distance $\sim 2 \text{ fm}$.

The rapidity dependence for the case of color singlet $\bar{c}c$ pair in P_c is shown in the Figure 7. The decrease of the curve at a small $y - y_{min}(s)$ happens due to a small- x suppression of the overlap $f_{3,5}(x_1, \alpha_c \approx \frac{1}{2}) \sim x_1$, which implies that the $\bar{c}c$ pair and the proton separated by a large rapidity gap cannot form a bound state. At large y we have a decrease due to suppression in the gluon PDF, which in the limit $x_1 \rightarrow 1$ behaves as $\sim (1 - x_1)^5$. Due to a factorized form of the pentaquark wave function (45), the rapidity dependence is similar for all cross-sections.

To understand the magnitude of the cross-section, we may for the moment assume dominance of the lowest charmonium state with proper quantum numbers (χ_c for a diagram (a) and $\psi(2S)$ for a diagram (b)), yielding

$$\left(\frac{d\sigma^{(a)}}{dy_{P_c}}\right)_{\text{estimate}} \sim \frac{1+x_1}{x_1} \mathcal{N} f_{3,5}^2\left(x_1, \alpha_c \approx \frac{1}{2}\right) \frac{d\sigma^{(pA \rightarrow \chi_c)}}{dy_{\chi_c}}, \quad (52)$$




Figure 7. Rapidity dependence of the cross-section $d\sigma/dy$ (if the pentaquark has a $\bar{c}c$ pair in the color singlet S -wave (left) and P -wave (right)). y is a pentaquark rapidity in a nucleon-nucleon center of mass (8), y_{RF} is a rapidity in the nucleus rest frame (11).

$$\left(\frac{d\sigma^{(b)}}{dy_{P_c}}\right)_{\text{estimate}} \sim \frac{1+x_1}{x_1} \mathcal{N} f_{3,5}^2 \left(x_1, \alpha_c \approx \frac{1}{2}\right) \frac{d\sigma^{(pA \rightarrow \psi(2S))}}{dy_{\psi(2S)}}. \quad (53)$$

where

$$f_{3,5}(x_1, \alpha_c) \equiv \int \prod_{i=1}^3 d\alpha_i f_5 \left(\left\{ \frac{\alpha_i}{1+x_1} \right\}, \frac{x_1 \alpha_c}{1+x_1}, \frac{x_1 \bar{\alpha}_c}{1+x_1} \right) f_3(\alpha_i) \delta \left(\sum_i \alpha_i = 1 \right), \quad (54)$$

is an overlap of the light cone distributions given by 43, and

$$\mathcal{N} = \left[\int d^2 R_{cc} \Phi_{LC}^{2D} \left(-\frac{M_{P_c}}{M_{P_c} - 2m_c} \vec{R}_{cc} \right) \sqrt{\frac{1}{\pi \langle R_{cc}^2 \rangle}} \exp \left(-\frac{R_{cc}^2}{\langle R_{cc}^2 \rangle} \right) \right]^2 \quad (55)$$

is an overlap of the transverse parts of the wave functions. We took $\alpha_c \approx 1/2$ in (52,53) since the momentum of the gluon is split approximately in equal proportion in a $\bar{c}c$ pair. Using the rapidity dependence from [69–71], we may get curves similar to what is shown in Figure 7.

In Figure 8 we show the dependence of the cross-section σ_a on the pentaquark parameters $\langle r_{cc} \rangle$ and $\langle R_{cc} \rangle$, for $\sqrt{s} \approx 7$ TeV. A $\bar{c}c$ dipole produced from a gluon has a small size $\sim m_c^{-1}$, so its overlap with a wide r_{cc} -distribution decreases when the width of the distribution $\langle r_{cc} \rangle$ increases. Similar origin has the dependence on $\langle R_{cc} \rangle$: the overlap of the two-nucleon correlation function (40) with the pentaquark wave function is small if the distance between $\bar{c}c$ and light quarks is zero, and is growing up to its peak value when $\langle R_{cc} \rangle$ reaches a value of a few fm. The true value of the parameter $\langle R_{cc} \rangle$ could be fixed in the future either from low-energy models of the pentaquark structure or from phenomenological study of the $P_\perp$ -slope of the produced pentaquarks. Due to a factorized form of a parametrization 45, the dependence of the other cross-sections ((b) – (d)) on the parameters $\langle R_{cc} \rangle$ and $\langle r_{cc} \rangle$ has a similar shape.

VII. CONCLUSION

In this paper we suggested that a hidden charm pentaquark P_c^+ might be produced in proton-nucleus collisions. In a collider kinematics, this production happens at forward rapidities, whereas in the fixed target experiments [72, 73]




Figure 8. (color online) Dependence of the integrated cross-section $\sigma^{(a)}$ (singlet P -wave $\bar{c}c$ pair) on pentaquark parameters $\langle r_{cc} \rangle$ and $\langle R_{cc} \rangle$ for $\sqrt{s} \approx 7$ TeV.

(nucleus rest frame) the pentaquarks are produced with relatively small rapidities and can be easily detected via invariant mass analysis of possible pentaquark decay products, as discussed in Sections II, VI. We estimated the cross-section for different color and internal orbital momentum of the $\bar{c}c$ inside a pentaquark and find that it is sizable. A key advantage of the suggested mechanism is that it does not involve any electroweak intermediaries, which provides a larger cross-section compared to photon-induced processes, and for typical $\mathcal{L} \sim \text{fb}^{-1}$ integrated luminosities the total number of produced pentaquarks is considerably larger than in case of weak decays of Λ_b reported in an LHCb paper [1]. An additional appeal of the suggested process is that it allows to access parameters of pentaquark wave function. In particular, a rapidity distribution of produced pentaquarks probes a fraction of pentaquark light-cone momentum carried by $\bar{c}c$ pair. A slope of the P_T -distribution is controlled by an average distance between center of mass of P_c^+ and center of the $\bar{c}c$ pair.

We think that experimentalists should analyze mass distributions of possible decay products of $P_c^+(J/\psi + p, \chi_{c1}p, \bar{D}$ and charmed baryon) in order to study its properties. If P_c^+ has neutral “siblings” with structure $udd\bar{c}c$ as suggested by several models [25–27], these could be also produced via $\bar{c}c + n \rightarrow P_c^0$ subprocess in pA collisions. In view of isospin invariance of strong interactions, the cross-section of such process is related to a P_c^+ production cross-section by a factor $(A - Z)/Z$.

When this manuscript was over, a similar process was suggested in [74], in which a pentaquark P_c^+ is produced via coalescence of quarks in pA and AA collisions. The evaluation was performed at midrapidity region in center-of-mass system, when a contribution from the so-called net quarks is negligible. In contrast, in our mechanism all the light quarks needed for the process stem from the nucleon. Since the two mechanisms work in different rapidity intervals, a direct comparison between them is not possible.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank our colleagues at UTFSM university for encouraging discussions. Especially we would like to thank E. Levin and B. Kopeliovich for numerous pedagogical discussions and seminal critics. This research was partially supported by the Fondecyt (Chile) grants 1140390 and 1140377. Powered@NLHPC: This research was partially

supported by the supercomputing infrastructure of the NLHPC (ECM-02). Also, we thank Yuri Ivanov for technical support of the USM HPC cluster where part of evaluations were done.

-
- [1] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, 072001 (2015) [arXiv:1507.03414 [hep-ex]].
 - [2] K. Golec-Biernat, E. Lewandowska, M. Serino, Z. Snyder and A. M. Stasto, arXiv:1507.08583 [hep-ph].
 - [3] M. Gell-Mann, Phys. Lett. **8** (1964) 214.
 - [4] S. J. Brodsky and F. S. Navarra, Phys. Lett. B **411**, 152 (1997) [hep-ph/9704348].
 - [5] S. J. Brodsky, I. A. Schmidt and G. F. de Teramond, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64** (1990) 1011.
 - [6] S. J. Brodsky, P. Hoyer, C. Peterson and N. Sakai, Phys. Lett. B **93**, 451 (1980).
 - [7] S. J. Brodsky, C. Peterson and N. Sakai, Phys. Rev. D **23**, 2745 (1981).
 - [8] M. Karliner and J. L. Rosner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, (2015), 122001 [arXiv:1506.06386 [hep-ph]].
 - [9] H. X. Chen, W. Chen, X. Liu, T. G. Steele and S. L. Zhu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, no. 17, 172001 (2015) [arXiv:1507.03717 [hep-ph]].
 - [10] G. J. Wang, L. Ma, X. Liu and S. L. Zhu, arXiv:1511.04845 [hep-ph].
 - [11] J. He, arXiv:1507.05200 [hep-ph].
 - [12] R. Chen, X. Liu, X. Q. Li and S. L. Zhu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **115**, no. 13, 132002 (2015) [arXiv:1507.03704 [hep-ph]].
 - [13] N. N. Scoccola, D. O. Riska and M. Rho, Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 5, 051501 (2015) [arXiv:1508.01172 [hep-ph]].
 - [14] G. Yang and J. Ping, arXiv:1511.09053 [hep-ph].
 - [15] R. Chen, X. Liu and S. L. Zhu, arXiv:1601.03233 [hep-ph].
 - [16] U. G. Meißner and J. A. Oller, Phys. Lett. B **751**, 59 (2015) [arXiv:1507.07478 [hep-ph]].
 - [17] D. E. Kahana and S. H. Kahana, arXiv:1512.01902 [hep-ph].
 - [18] M. I. Eides, V. Y. Petrov and M. V. Polyakov, arXiv:1512.00426 [hep-ph].
 - [19] A. Mironov and A. Morozov, JETP Lett. **102**, no. 5, 271 (2015) [arXiv:1507.04694 [hep-ph]].
 - [20] C. W. Xiao and U.-G. Meißner, arXiv:1508.00924 [hep-ph].
 - [21] F. K. Guo, U. G. Meißner, W. Wang and Z. Yang, Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 7, 071502 (2015) [arXiv:1507.04950 [hep-ph]].
 - [22] V. V. Anisovich, M. A. Matveev, A. V. Sarantsev and A. N. Semenova, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **30**, 1550212 (2015) [arXiv:1509.03028 [hep-ph]].
 - [23] E. Wang, H. X. Chen, L. S. Geng, D. M. Li and E. Oset, arXiv:1512.01959 [hep-ph].
 - [24] P. Jimenez-Delgado, T. J. Hobbs, J. T. Londergan and W. Melnitchouk, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, no. 8, 082002 (2015) [arXiv:1408.1708 [hep-ph]].
 - [25] G. N. Li, M. He and X. G. He, arXiv:1507.08252 [hep-ph].
 - [26] R. A. Briceño *et al.*, arXiv:1511.06779 [hep-ph].
 - [27] A. Feijoo, V. K. Magas, A. Ramos and E. Oset, arXiv:1512.08152 [hep-ph].
 - [28] M. Karliner and J. L. Rosner, Phys. Lett. B **752**, 329 (2016) [arXiv:1508.01496 [hep-ph]].
 - [29] V. Kubarovsky and M. B. Voloshin, Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 3, 031502 (2015) [arXiv:1508.00888 [hep-ph]].
 - [30] Q. Wang, X. H. Liu and Q. Zhao, Phys. Rev. D **92**, 034022 (2015) [arXiv:1508.00339 [hep-ph]].
 - [31] Q. F. Lü, X. Y. Wang, J. J. Xie, X. R. Chen and Y. B. Dong, arXiv:1510.06271 [hep-ph].
 - [32] K. H. Hicks, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **55**, 647 (2005) [hep-ex/0504027].
 - [33] N. Brambilla *et al.* [Quarkonium Working Group Collaboration], hep-ph/0412158.
 - [34] M. Bedjidian *et al.*, hep-ph/0311048.
 - [35] S. J. Brodsky and J. P. Lansberg, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 051502 (2010) [arXiv:0908.0754 [hep-ph]].
 - [36] B. Kopeliovich, A. Tarasov and J. Hufner, Nucl. Phys. A **696**, 669 (2001) [hep-ph/0104256].
 - [37] B. Z. Kopeliovich, I. K. Potashnikova and I. Schmidt, Phys. Rev. C **73**, 034901 (2006) [hep-ph/0508277].
 - [38] B. Z. Kopeliovich, E. Levin, I. Schmidt and M. Siddikov, Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 3, 034023 (2015) [arXiv:1501.01607 [hep-ph]].
 - [39] V. Kopeliovich and I. Potashnikova, arXiv:1510.05958 [hep-ph].
 - [40] B. Z. Kopeliovich and A. V. Tarasov, Nucl. Phys. A **710**, 180 (2002) [hep-ph/0205151].
 - [41] S. P. Baranov and A. Szczurek, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 054016 (2008) [arXiv:0710.1792 [hep-ph]].
 - [42] S. P. Baranov, A. V. Lipatov and N. P. Zotov, Eur. Phys. J. C **75**, no. 9, 455 (2015) [arXiv:1508.05480 [hep-ph]].
 - [43] S. P. Baranov, A. V. Lipatov and N. P. Zotov, arXiv:1510.02411 [hep-ph].
 - [44] K. J. Golec-Biernat, A. D. Martin and M. G. Ryskin, Phys. Lett. B **456**, 232 (1999) [hep-ph/9903327].
 - [45] J. B. Kogut and D. E. Soper, Phys. Rev. D **1**, 2901 (1970).
 - [46] G. P. Korchemsky, J. Kotanski and A. N. Manashov, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 122002 (2002) [hep-ph/0111185].
 - [47] Yu. Kovchegov, E. Levin, “*Quantum Chromodynamics at high energy*”, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK. ISBN: 9780521112574
 - [48] H. Kowalski and D. Teaney, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 114005 (2003) [hep-ph/0304189].
 - [49] T. Tagami, Prog. Theor. Phys. **21** (4) 533-561 (1959). [doi:10.1143/PTP.21.533]
 - [50] J. S. Levinger, Phys. Lett. B **82**, 181 (1979).
 - [51] M. Alvioli, H.-J. Drescher and M. Strikman, Phys. Lett. B **680**, 225 (2009) [arXiv:0905.2670 [nucl-th]].
 - [52] C. Colle, W. Cosyn, J. Ryckebusch and M. Vanhalst, Phys. Rev. C **89**, no. 2, 024603 (2014) [arXiv:1311.1980 [nucl-th]].
 - [53] R. D. Viollier and J. D. Walecka, Acta Phys. Polon. B **8**, 25 (1977).

- [54] X. G. Cao, X. Z. Cai, Y. G. Ma, D. Q. Fang, G. Q. Zhang, W. Guo, J. G. Chen and J. S. Wang, Phys. Rev. C **86**, 044620 (2012) [arXiv:1211.6906 [nucl-th]].
- [55] T. Neff, H. Feldmeier and W. Horiuchi, Phys. Rev. C **92**, no. 2, 024003 (2015) [arXiv:1506.02237 [nucl-th]].
- [56] K. S. Egiyan *et al.* [CLAS Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 082501 (2006) [nucl-ex/0508026].
- [57] L. L. Frankfurt, M. I. Strikman, D. B. Day and M. Sargsian, Phys. Rev. C **48**, 2451 (1993).
- [58] E. Piasetzky, M. Sargsian, L. Frankfurt, M. Strikman and J. W. Watson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 162504 (2006) [nucl-th/0604012].
- [59] O. Hen *et al.*, Science **346**, 614 (2014) [arXiv:1412.0138 [nucl-ex]].
- [60] C. Colle, O. Hen, W. Cosyn, I. Korover, E. Piasetzky, J. Ryckebusch and L. B. Weinstein, Phys. Rev. C **92**, no. 2, 024604 (2015) [arXiv:1503.06050 [nucl-th]].
- [61] M. Alvioli, C. Ciofi degli Atti, I. Marchino, V. Palli and H. Morita, Phys. Rev. C **78**, 031601 (2008) [arXiv:0807.0873 [nucl-th]].
- [62] R. B. Wiringa, V. G. J. Stoks and R. Schiavilla, Phys. Rev. C **51** (1995) 38.
- [63] L. Frankfurt, W. Koepf and M. Strikman, Phys. Rev. D **57**, 512 (1998) [hep-ph/9702216].
- [64] P. Hoyer and S. Peigne, Phys. Rev. D **61**, 031501 (2000) [hep-ph/9909519].
- [65] D. Diakonov, V. Petrov and M. V. Polyakov, Z. Phys. A **359**, 305 (1997) [hep-ph/9703373].
- [66] C. Lorce, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 054019 (2006) [hep-ph/0603231].
- [67] E. Eichten, K. Gottfried, T. Kinoshita, K. D. Lane and T. M. Yan, Phys. Rev. D **21** (1980) 203.
- [68] A. H. Rezaeian, M. Siddikov, M. Van de Klundert and R. Venugopalan, Phys. Rev. D **87**, no. 3, 034002 (2013) [arXiv:1212.2974].
- [69] K. Aamodt *et al.* [ALICE Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **704**, 442 (2011) [Phys. Lett. B **718**, 692 (2012)] [arXiv:1105.0380 [hep-ex]].
- [70] R. Aaij *et al.* [LHCb Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **718**, 431 (2013) [arXiv:1204.1462 [hep-ex]].
- [71] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], JHEP **1202**, 011 (2012) [arXiv:1111.1557 [hep-ex]].
- [72] S. J. Brodsky, F. Fleuret, C. Hadjidakis and J. P. Lansberg, Phys. Rept. **522** (2013), 239 [arXiv:1202.6585 [hep-ph]].
- [73] J. P. Lansberg, S. J. Brodsky, F. Fleuret and C. Hadjidakis, Few Body Syst. **53**, 11 (2012) [arXiv:1204.5793 [hep-ph]].
- [74] R. Q. Wang, J. Song, K. J. Sun, L. W. Chen, G. Li and F. L. Shao, arXiv:1601.02835 [hep-ph].